



Nigeria Reading and Access Research Activity

Analysis of Access to Education Programs in Bauchi and Sokoto States

August 2014

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development Nigeria (USAID|Nigeria). It was prepared by RTI International.

Nigeria Reading and Access Research Activity

Analysis of Access to Education Programs in Bauchi and Sokoto States

Contract EHC-E-00-04-00004-00

EdData II Technical and Managerial Assistance, Task Number 26

Task Order Number AID-620-BC-14-00002

Activity Start/End Date: February 14, 2014 to November 13, 2015

August 2014

Prepared for
Tim Curtin, COR
USAID|Nigeria

Prepared by
RTI International
3040 Cornwallis Road
Post Office Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2194
Authors: Aisha Garba and Nasir Umar
Email address: aishagarba2012@gmail.com dotnaseer@yahoo.com

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

RTI International is one of the world's leading research institutes, dedicated to improving the human condition by turning knowledge into practice. Our staff of more than 3,700 provides research and technical services to governments and businesses in more than 75 countries in the areas of health and pharmaceuticals, education and training, surveys and statistics, advanced technology, international development, economic and social policy, energy and the environment, and laboratory testing and chemical analysis. For more information, visit www.rti.org.

RTI International is a trade name of Research Triangle Institute.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	vi
Introduction	1
Purpose of the study.....	1
Scope and structure of the report	1
Methodology and main activities	2
Systematic literature review	2
Key informant interviews.....	2
Main activities	2
Commentary on data quality, reliability, and limitation.....	3
Systematic literature review: Countries similar to Nigeria.....	3
Review methods	3
Review findings	4
Providing students with support packages	4
Reduction or abolition of school fees	4
Conditional cash transfers	5
Strengthening civil society to provide basic education	5
Infrastructural support.....	5
Incentive to teachers	5
Student feeding program.....	6
Scholarship programs	6
Findings: Interventions in Bauchi and Sokoto.....	6
Integrated Qur’anic Education (IQE).....	6
Target and objectives of the program	6
Participant identification and enrolment	7
Program implementation.....	7
Associated costs	7
Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the IQE program	8
Constraints to program effectiveness.....	8
Girls’ Education Program (GEP 3)	8
Participant identification and enrollment.....	9
Program implementation.....	9
Associated costs	10
Monitoring and impact of the program	10
Constraints to program effectiveness.....	10

Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT)	10
Target and objectives of the program	10
Participant identification and enrollment.....	11
Program implementation.....	11
Associated costs	11
M&E of the program	11
Constraints to program effectiveness.....	11
NEI-Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC).....	12
Target and objectives of the program	12
Participant identification and enrollment.....	12
Program implementation.....	12
Associated costs	12
M&E of the program	13
Constraints to program effectiveness.....	13
Almajiri Integrated Model Schools (AIMS).....	13
Target and objectives of the program	13
Participant identification and enrollment.....	13
Implementation of the program	13
UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 1 School	13
UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 2 School	14
UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 3 School	14
Associated costs of the program.....	14
Monitoring & impact of the program	14
Constraints to effectiveness of the program	14
Discussion and conclusions.....	15
Challenges and Recommendations.....	15
References	20
Annex 1. Questionnaires.....	24
Annex 2. Field Work: People Interviewed.....	36

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of findings from included articles	17
Table 2. Access analysis frame Bauchi state	39
Table 3. Access analysis frame Sokoto state	40

List of Acronyms

AIMS	Almajiri Integrated Model School
CAG	Community Action Group
CCT	conditional cash transfer
CSI	child status index
CSO	civil society organization
DFID	Department for International Development
ESSPIN	Education Sector Support Program in Nigeria
FOMWAN	Federation of Muslim Women Association of Nigeria
IQTE	Islamiyya, Qur’anic, and Tsangaya education
LGEA	Local Government Education Authority
LGA	Local Government Authority
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MORA	Ministry of Religious Affairs
NGO	nongovernmental organization
PPP	public-private partnership
SAME	State Agency for Mass Education
SBMC	school-based management committee
SES	socioeconomic status
SUBEB	State Universal Basic Education Board
QSIC	Quaranic School Integration Committee
UBEC	Universal Basic Education Commission
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Executive Summary

Several programs are currently being implemented or have been implemented in Bauchi and Sokoto states to address issues of access to education for girls, vulnerable populations, and Almajiri more generally. These programs include intervention(s) designed to alleviate the cost of schooling through conditional cash transfers, material supports, and subsidies (uniforms, books, etc.); to affect parental attitudes towards and values regarding formal schooling; or to enhance the quality and availability of secular schooling through Islamiyya, Qur'anic, and Tsangaya education (IQTE) integration and model schools. However, evidence of the relative effectiveness of these interventions in these settings is limited.

With a focus on Bauchi and Sokoto states, this study sought to provide evidence of how these different programs affect the target populations and of their relative effectiveness in achieving their desired results. Such evidence would be used to ascertain which one of these interventions or programs may be a suitable candidate for continued support or scale up under future donor-funded programs for both girls and Almajiri.

Key informants were interviewed on an intervention designed to increase access to education for girls and marginalized populations, including Almajiri, in Sokoto and Bauchi in April 2014. The interviews were supplemented with a critical review of published literature on best practice programs that target girls and vulnerable populations in countries similar to Nigeria and in Nigeria. A systematic review of the literature identified eight areas of focus among interventions aimed at addressing barriers to education facing girls and marginalized populations. Specifically, these interventions involved student support packages, reduction or abolition of school fees, conditional cash transfers, civil society strengthening, infrastructural support, incentives to teachers, student feeding programs, and scholarship programs.

Not all of the studies disaggregated their findings, or were specifically targeted to girls. It is assumed, however, that when a general increase in school enrollment, retention, and progression is reported, girls are among the beneficiaries. Further, in many countries in sub-Saharan Africa girls, especially in rural areas, are marginalized; therefore interventions targeting girls by proxy are also targeting marginalized members of the community. In general, therefore, there is overwhelming evidence of the effectiveness of the aforementioned interventions in improving access to education for girls and marginalized members of the society in countries similar to Nigeria. Although the interventions in Sokoto and Bauchi states are yet to be evaluated, and there are limitations with the monitoring data available, enrollment records from the programs examined in Bauchi and Sokoto states showed encouraging signs and the potential to achieve the desired impact.

Introduction

According to the 2008 progress report on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Nigeria may not achieve the MDG on universal primary education and gender equality unless enrollment is dramatically improved and the gap between boys' and girls' enrollment is narrowed (United Nations [UN]), 2008).[1] About a third of eligible children in 10 states, an estimated 3.7 million children, remain out of school (Independent Commission for Aid Impact [ICAI], 2012).[2]

Access to education remains the major constraint to achieving the MDG targets for Nigeria. The 2009 Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report identified some constraints to universal basic education, especially for girls and marginalized groups (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2009).[3] Key constraints identified include the inability to meet some of the direct and hidden costs associated with schooling and socio-cultural attitudes toward education. Parents may not want to send their children to school because of costs associated with schooling, because of cultural norms, or because they need the children's help in generating income for the family. Governments and development partners have invested millions of dollars on various interventions aimed at addressing these barriers to education.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was first to review the literature of best practice education programs that target girls that have been implemented in countries similar ethnographically to Nigeria.

The study also evaluated existing or recently completed intervention(s) designed to: a) alleviate the cost of schooling through conditional cash transfers, material supports, and subsidies including uniforms, books, etc.; b) affect parental attitudes and values towards formal schooling; and c) enhance the quality and availability of secular schooling through IQTE integration and model schools, in Bauchi and Sokoto states. The aim was to determine which of these intervention(s) may be suitable for continued support or scale up under donor-funded programs providing access to basic education for both girls and Almajiri, and other marginalized groups in the society. Although the study focused on Bauchi and Sokoto states, relevant information and examples from other northern states Jigawa, Kano, and Katsina are cited where necessary.

Scope and structure of the report

This study is aimed at providing the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) with clarity on how the aforementioned programs affect the target populations and their relative effectiveness in achieving their desired objectives. This analysis reviewed the following programs: conditional cash transfer programs implemented in Bauchi and Sokoto states (World Bank); Northern

Education Initiative (NEI) program for orphans and vulnerable children (USAID); targeted scholarship programs implemented by Girls' Education Program ([GEP] UNICEF); whole school development enrollment campaigns (State Universal Basic Education Board [SUBEB]); integrated Qur'anic education (IQE) and Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) Almajiri integrated model schools.

The report is divided into two sections. The first section reports findings of best practice programs that target girls from countries that are similar ethnographically to Nigeria. The second section reports findings from key informant interviews conducted in Bauchi and Sokoto states, followed by general discussion and conclusions.

Methodology and main activities

Systematic literature review

Key informant interviews were supplemented with a systematic literature review of best practice programs that target girls that were implemented in countries that are similar ethnographically to Nigeria.

Key informant interviews

Interviews on interventions designed to increase access to education for girls and other marginalized populations, including Almajiri, in Sokoto and Bauchi states were conducted in April 2014. Interviewees were important stakeholders including policy makers, program focal persons, and directors at the Ministry of Education (MOE), Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA), SUBEB, and program staff. A list of prospective key informants was drawn up in collaboration with the Reading and Access Research Activity (RARA) Bauchi and Sokoto state research coordinators. Requests for additional informants were elicited from the original group of interviewees, leading to a snowball sampling process. Interviewees were approached and asked to participate in an interview that would last between 45 and 60 minutes. Verbal informed consent was obtained from each interviewee. In total, 30 informants were approached in Bauchi and Sokoto states, and all agreed to be interviewed. Data were collected using the data collection tools (questionnaires) developed by consultants (*Annex 1*)

Main activities

Main activities conducted included the development of data collection tools (questionnaires), inception meetings with the RARA Bauchi and Sokoto state research coordinators, key informant interviews in Bauchi and Sokoto states, development of a search strategy for systematic literature search, a systematic review of literature on barriers to access, and finally, a debriefing.

Commentary on data quality, reliability, and limitation

Data sharing among partner organizations was limited—not all the project-related information was available to implementing partners, i.e., between grantees and government agencies. Further, even when the information was available, there were cases where state program officers were not readily willing to share the available data, probably for fear of political consequences. To ensure the objectivity and the accuracy of this report, only information properly supported by evidence or documented by the state program officers was included.

Systematic literature review: Countries similar to Nigeria

Review methods

Wherever possible, the approach taken in this systematic review follows the PRISMA (preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis) reporting guidelines (Moher, et al., 2009).[4] Articles included in this review described studies on existing or recently completed interventions designed to: a) alleviate the cost of schooling through conditional cash transfers, material supports, and subsidies including uniforms, books, etc.; b) affect parental attitudes and values towards formal schooling and c) enhance the quality and availability of secular schooling through IQTE integration and model schools or both. No restrictions on study design or publication date were imposed. Study participants included girls, boys, and other marginalized populations, including Almajiri, who participated in studies on school enrollment, drop out, retention, and progression in sub-Saharan Africa. Only articles written in English were included. Editorials, letters, theses, commentaries, and theoretical debates were excluded.

Identifying the relevant articles involved searching electronic databases, and the online search was supplemented by hand searching relevant journals and by examining the reference lists of the retrieved articles and the online holdings of international development organizations and research firms. The titles and abstracts of identified articles were first screened for eligibility, with the full text publication of all potential articles subsequently retrieved for further assessment.

To extract relevant information from the identified articles, a data extraction form was developed. The data fields contained in the data extraction form included information on study authors, publication date, study country, study subjects, interventions, and major findings. The form was pilot-tested on five of the included studies and then revised based on this experience to improve its appropriateness across the studies reviewed. Data from the included studies were extracted using the data extraction form.

Qualitative methods (narrative) and descriptive measures (frequencies and percentages) were used to summarize and present the results. It was not possible to compute summary measures (metadata) for study outcomes due to the heterogeneous nature of the included studies and the variability of the outcome measures (see *Table 1*).

Review findings

Out of the 545 articles originally identified, 505 were excluded during preliminary screening phase. After retrieval and review of the remaining 40 studies, a further 22 articles were found not to meet the inclusion criteria and were subsequently excluded. This left a total of 18 articles that were included in the review. Due to the limited number of the articles identified and the observed variation in the focus of the intervention outcomes reported, we chose not to compute summary measures. Instead, a qualitative approach was chosen to synthesize the results, as shown below.

The review of the extracted data identified eight areas of focus aimed at addressing barriers to education of girls and marginalized populations. Specifically, interventions designed to increase access to education for girls and marginalized populations involved student support packages (16% of the studies)[5–7], reduction or abolition of school fees (25% of the studies)[8–12], conditional cash transfers (11% of the studies)[13, 14], civil society strengthening (5% of the studies)[15], infrastructural support (11% of the studies)[15, 16], incentive to teachers (5% of the studies)[17], student feeding programs (11% of the studies)[18, 19] and scholarship programs (16% of the studies)[20–22]. We found no literature on effectiveness of interventions targeting Almajiri, religious schooling interventions, or mainstreaming non-formal learners (see *Table 1*). A more detail description of these focal areas follows.

Providing students with support packages

A study from Kenya that investigated the impact of providing free uniforms, textbooks together with construction of classrooms found a 15% increase in years of schooling (Kremer, Moulin, & Namunyu, (2002).[6] A different study in Kenya, however, found no effect on school enrollment, attendance, and progression observed; Though it did show a positive effect on test scores reported (Glewwe & Olinto, 2004).[7] Joseph and Wodon reported that at the primary school level, availability of extra math text books marginally increased first grade enrollment and reduced drop out. At the middle-school level, availability of English text books showed a negative correlation with changes in enrollment of girls (Joseph & Wodon, 2012).[5]

Reduction or abolition of school fees

Direct and indirect cost has long been associated with lack of enrollment in school or dropping out of school, mostly due to parents' inability to cover the cost of schooling. Reducing or eliminating the cost of schooling is one way to address financial barriers to education. In Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, and Uganda reducing or abolishing school fees led to a significant increase in school enrollment of both boys and girls. Further, this has also led to reduction in late enrollment (Petrosino, et al., 2012; Fiszbein, Schady, & Ferreira, 2009; Grogan, 2009; and Bategeka & Okurut,

2005).[8-10, 12] In South Africa, however, secondary enrollment for girls increased only in the poorest households and not at all in better-off homes (Borkum, 2009).[11]

Conditional cash transfers

Baird, McIntosh, and Özler explored the effect of conditional and unconditional cash transfers targeted at adolescent girls' schooling and non-schooling outcomes. Findings from the study showed that school enrollment improved with both conditional and unconditional cash transfers; however, the improvement in girls' enrollment in school was higher with the conditional transfers (Baird, McIntosh, & Özler, 2010).[13], although negative non-schooling outcomes such as early pregnancy and marriage were higher among adolescent girls who received conditional cash transfers (Baird, McIntosh, & Özler, 2010).[13] In Kano, Nigeria, conditional cash transfer was associated with school participation by 10% (World Bank, 2011).[14]

Strengthening civil society to provide basic education

Another strategy adopted in Guinea was to strengthen civil society's ability to provide literacy programs, although the impact of this intervention has not been evaluated. The potential to provide basic education to girls and marginalized members of the society who would otherwise go without education has been reported (Avolio-Toly, 2010).[15]

Infrastructural support

Infrastructural support refers to interventions aimed at reducing the distance to the schools or addressing socio-cultural barriers to education (e.g., building separate toilets for boys and girls, building separate classrooms for boys and girls, etc.). Proximity of school to villages or communities was associated with increased school enrollment, especially for girls (Lehman, 2003).[16] Distance to school was found to be inversely proportional to school enrollment. According to Lehman, this may have been because going to another village or community was considered foreign and not safe for girls (Lehman, 2003).[16] In Mali, an intervention aimed at addressing cultural barriers to education (e.g., parents of girls, and girls themselves, did not want girls in the same class with boys, therefore they built a separate class for boys and girls). Evaluation of this intervention showed that female-only classes led to better participation for girls and women in the community (Avolio-Toly, 2010).[15]

Incentive to teachers

Incentive given to teachers such as extra money for attendance and other student performance outcomes was found to have significant, positive effects on increasing school attendance and school enrollment, decreasing dropouts, and improving mathematics and language scores in Kenya (Duflo, Hanna, & Ryan, 2007).[17]

Student feeding program

School feeding has been widely used as a strategy to improve school attendance and learning outcomes. Whaley and colleagues evaluated the impact of a school feeding program in Kenya, where the authors recorded a significant increase in school enrollment of both boys and girls (Whaley et al., 2003).[18] Another study, however, found no statistical difference in enrollment of girls before and after food aid (Akyeampong, et al., 2007).[19]

Scholarship programs

Girls' merit scholarships were associated with improved test scores and an increase in secondary school enrollment in western Kenya (Friedman et al., 2011).[22] Chapman and Mushlin also reported continued access, retention, and progression in Djibouti, Sierra Leone, as a result of scholarships to girls (Chapman & Mushlin, 2008).[21] In Ghana, scholarships for girls were credited with increasing primary school enrollment of girls in program areas, the difference in enrollment rates of boys to girls in program primary schools was narrowed, and retention among boys and girls declined (Chapman, Emert, & Osei, 2003).[20]

Findings: Interventions in Bauchi and Sokoto

Integrated Qur'anic Education (IQE)

Target and objectives of the program

Integration in this context refers to the introduction of secular curricula into Qur'anic schools or bringing the Qur'anic school into a secular system. The integration program was initially driven by UBEC, with about ₦6 million being made available to 14 participating states including Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi, Kwara, Nassarawa, Niger, Sokoto, Yobe, and Zamfara states in 2005. The state governments now play a significant role in the implementation and funding of the program.

IQE is a means of increasing access to formal education for young children, both boys and girls, who presently attend Qur'anic schools. The children targeted are mostly the itinerant students or Almajiri of Tsangaya schools, as well as children who have not been enrolled in formal schools for some reason. These children are usually found in the Qur'anic schools or on the streets.

The primary objective of the IQE program is to harmonize and strengthen the two-education systems—the traditional Qur'anic school and basic formal education. The integration involves the inclusion of core subjects such as English, mathematics, social sciences, sciences, and vocational education in Qur'anic school curricula. The IQE program aims to enable students' mainstream access to a formal system to further their studies, help students secure employment or learn a trade that will empower them to make a decent living, and enable students to positively contribute to society in general.

Participant identification and enrolment

Qur'anic schools participate in IQE programs if the proprietor, or malam, chooses to participate. Once the Qur'anic school is accepted into the program, all the Almajiri in the school become participants in the program. The IQE program in both Bauchi and Sokoto states is run by three government agencies: the State Agency for Mass Education (SAME) oversees 543 IQE centers, with a total boys to girls ratio of 35,141:36,004 (total of 71,145); SUBEB oversees 87 centers, with a boys to girls ratio of 23,960:22,133 (total of 56,093); MORA oversees 1 center, with a boys to girls ratio of 1,209:0 (total of 1,209). The IQE program in Bauchi is supported by the Tsangaya Director General's (DG's) office.

Program implementation

Malams, traditionally owned the Qur'anic schools. The malam, therefore, has to express his interest in joining the IQE program, after which the state agencies implementing the program will assess the suitability of the school to join the program. Upon acceptance of the Qur'anic school into the program, the malam receives a cash grant, material supports to the school and students (e.g., reading and writing materials, books, etc.), and a commitment to provide food for the students. The school receives instructors/facilitators that will teach or introduce formal courses into the school. Three state agencies share responsibility for implementing the IQE program: SAME, MORA, and SUBEB.

Some of the strategies used in the state to garner support for IQE implementation included proactive advocacy and sensitization visits to relevant stakeholders (Sultanate Council, House Committee on Education, Ministry for Local Government and Community Development and communities); establishment of an association of IQE implementers in the state; introduction of the student-feeding program in IQE centers; and training and retraining of the nonformal education (NFE)/IQE personnel and facilitators in collaboration with training institutions such as Sokoto State College Of Education/state polytechnic/Usman Danfodio University Sokoto and development partners.

Other strategies were the provision of water, sanitation, and health (WASH) facilities in IQE centers, involvement of malams in selection and recruitment of facilitators, issuance of basic and post-literacy certificates to IQE graduates to facilitate mainstreaming of learners to formal schooling (primary, junior secondary, and beyond), and partnerships with civil society organizations such as Federation of Muslim Women Association of Nigeria (FOMWAN) and other community-based organizations.

Associated costs

Information on total cost associated with implementing and running the IQE program was not available. However, in 2013, over ₦33 million was spent on improvement of the IQE learning environment through construction and renovation to attract and accommodate more learners; ₦11.5 million was spent on incorporation of vocational /income generation skills into the program; ₦5 million was spent on provision of

relevant instructional/learning materials to facilitate learning; and ₦5 million was spent to train community based management committee members and establish them at the IQE centers to ease management problems. Recruitment and regular payment of facilitators at state and local government area (LGA) levels was over ₦10,815,000 million paid monthly. The remuneration of facilitators and proprietors was increased to ₦7,500 monthly. The average cost per learner at an IQE center was estimated at about ₦2,000 per month in 2013.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the IQE program

A focal person (a person serving as the coordinator of a program) monitored the IQE program through routine visits to the IQE centers, although the supervisory visit did not involve the use of a formal M&E tool. The IQE program in the states has not been formally evaluated; however, state records showed an increase in the number of malams accepting integration of basic education into Qur'anic schools, leading to a rise in the number of IQE centers from 4 in 1996 to 631 now. In Sokoto, enrollment increased from 217 to 117,238 learners, and 25,000 IQE learners were mainstreamed, some of whom are now graduates of tertiary education.

Constraints to program effectiveness

Major constraints to the IQE program reported included inadequate qualified facilitators to teach core subjects at the IQE centers; poor learning environments in most of the IQE centers, for example, the absence of WASH facilities in most of the IQE centers; and inadequate provision of food for the Almajiri children, as not all children/centers were covered under the feeding program.

Other constraints identified were low budgetary allocations and releases of funds, inadequate instructional and learning materials, and lack of baseline data to inform planning and programmatic decisions. It was also noted that some malams and parents still expressed skepticism of the IQE program due to low level of awareness.

Girls' Education Program (GEP 3)

GEP 3 has many components:

- Female Teacher Training Scheme (FTTS)—Program to enroll and train female high school graduates as teachers; this is the main component of the GEP program.
- School grants—Funds given to improve the condition of the schools.
- Whole school development program (WSDP)—Training for school-based management committees (SBMCs) and funds management.
- IQTE training—Training in education integration for SBMCs and other community members.

Before GEP 3, there was GEP 1 and 2; the objective of GEP 1 was to make schools girl-friendly by constructing separate toilets for boys and girls and sensitizing the community to the need to educate girls and repair schools so that schools would be more accommodating for girls. GEP 2 focused further on community sensitization and school repairs through SBMCs.

The primary focus of GEP 3 has been on the girls' education scholarship program funded in both Bauchi and Sokoto states by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) and implemented by UNICEF in collaboration with the respective state governments. The program targets rural girls who have graduated from high school but are unable to proceed further due to financial constraints and trains these girls as teachers and role models. The scholarship recipients are expected to sign a bond stating that after completion of their studies they will come back to their communities to serve. The objective is to address the shortage of female teachers in rural areas.

In Bauchi and Sokoto states, GEP has been implemented by SUBEB. GEP is being implemented in all 20 LGAs of Bauchi State, but due to challenges associated with such a large-scale implementation, certain LGAs were dropped in Sokoto State. The program is now implemented only in Gudu, Isa, Rabah, Tangaza, Tureta, and Yabo LGAs of Sokoto State.

In Bauchi, five officers have been responsible for the program in the state, including the focal officer (liaison and in charge of the program within a Ministry), the secretary of the program, Deputy Director of School services, Permanent member–SUBEB, and the Program Desk Officer. In Sokoto, the Director of Planning Research and Statistics of the MOE is the focal person i.e., serving as the coordinator for the program, and a technical working group, supported by a desk officer, manages the program.

Participant identification and enrollment

In Bauchi and Sokoto, GEP has used eligibility criteria to identify and enroll participants. The selection committee in the states consisted of staff from SUBEB, SAME, and DFID. The following criteria were used to screen and select girls for the program: a) rural, high school graduates; b) exam results (minimum of 5 pass credits in Bauchi; 2 credit and 2 passes in Sokoto; c) native of the state; d) signed bond asserting that after graduating, the girl will go back to her community to teach; e) economic status of the family, with those from economically disadvantaged families as the primary targets.

Program implementation

In Bauchi and Sokoto, GEP has paid school fees and feeding and accommodation fees directly to the colleges of the participants for the duration of their study/training as teachers. The participants were also given ₦5,000 monthly allowance and expected to return to their communities to teach after graduation from teacher colleges.

Associated costs

In Bauchi and Sokoto states, the program cost for GEP was not clear; however, the direct cost for participant allowances was ₦50,000 per girl per annum.

Monitoring and impact of the program

The method used for monitoring GEP was field supervision by program officers to check the well being of the participants at school, though no tool was used to record observations. The target number for GEP 3 was 600 girls enrolled yearly; the expected outcome of the program is a 50% increase in the number of female teachers in rural areas. So far, from 2010 to 2014, 825 girls have been enrolled in GEP 3, and 348 girls were trained as teachers in Bauchi. In Sokoto, 900 girls have been enrolled so far; the number of girls trained as teachers was not clear.

Constraints to program effectiveness

In Bauchi and Sokoto states, the programs have yet to be formally evaluated by the states, and efforts to obtain impact assessment reports from UNICEF were unsuccessful. The relative effectiveness of the programs, therefore, was not objectively clear. However, based on anecdotal information, the program officers believed GEP to be a success, as evidenced by community support, government support, and the number of girls so far enrolled and trained. The major constraint mentioned was the delay in release of counterpart funds by state governments.

Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT)

Target and objectives of the program

The CCT program in Bauchi was designed by the World Bank and funded by the federal government through MDGs funding. The program was implemented by SUBEB with technical support from UNICEF. Program target was 10,000 households with girls aged 7–15 years, who were either in or out of school or were transiting from the upper level of primary school to junior secondary school. The program was aimed at empowering parents with the ability to provide for all the financial needs of their girls while in school. The main objectives of the program were to increase girls' enrollment, retention, and completion at the upper level of primary school and to enhance girl's transition from the upper primary level to the junior secondary school level. The program, however, did not last beyond the first cash transfer due to program ownership and funding issues between SUBEB and MDGs Bauchi state office. The two agencies could not determine who should implement the program in the state; as a result, the government shut down the program.

The only activity related to the CCT program in Sokoto State was a meeting with UNICEF officials that took place March 21, 2013, to discuss the possibility of starting the CCT program in the state. Following the meeting, program implementation units were set up, and organizational structure, functions, and responsibilities of the units were established. However, as of this report, no funds had been made available to start the program.

Participant identification and enrollment

To identify eligible beneficiaries for the CCT the program in Bauchi State, a mixture of survey and eligibility criteria were used. First, six local governments were identified (Dambam, Darazo, Dass, Giade, Kirfi, Zaki) as the poorest local governments through a poverty mapping survey from the Bureau of Statistics. Within the six local governments, the following criteria for eligibility were used to select and enroll 10,000 poorest households in the program: a) household lacked appropriate dwelling place; b) household lacked regular means of income; c) household headed by disadvantage females; d) household with orphans or other vulnerable children; e) household not receiving benefits from other programs; f) household girls of upper level primary age enrolled in or dropped out of school.

Program implementation

CCT was the only intervention from which participants received cash directly. Each participant girl was paid ₦5,000 four times per year. The money was paid to the mother or the caregiver of the participating girl through the SBMC of the school at which the girl was enrolled. The cash transfers were disbursed one week prior to the commencement of the school term to enable preparation for school and monitoring of compliance.

Associated costs

CCT in Bauchi State was supposed to be a three-year program, budgeted at ₦600,000,000 in total, or four payments per year of ₦5,000 per payment per participant.

M&E of the program

To monitor the CCT program in Bauchi, SUBEB officers were supposed to collect attendance records from schools on a quarterly basis and compliance records compiled by M&E officers and field supervisors on monthly basis.

Program indicators included enrollment, attendance, completion, and transition rates in schools. Expected outcomes included a 25% increase in the number of girls in basic education schools, a 25% increase in transition rates of girls from lower level primary to higher level and junior secondary schools, a 25% increase in school attendance for girls in basic education school, and a 100% increase in household expenditures on girls' education. There were no actual data on outcomes because the program was shut down immediately after the first cash transfer.

Constraints to program effectiveness

Although the CCT programs were not deemed worthy of further piloting or implementation, they had a clear process review and baseline data at the inception stage. The programs were strategically planned but cut short after one cash transfer to 9,874 participants. It is difficult to determine how effective CCT would have been, though program officers reported an increase in the attendance rate of 25% after just one transfer.

NEI-Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC)

Target and objectives of the program

In both Bauchi and Sokoto states, NEI-OVC was a joint program with USAID. The objective of NEI-OVC in these states was to provide access to basic quality education for OVC of 0–17 years of age in the state. The program started in 2009 and ended in 2013–2014 in both Bauchi and Sokoto. The program covered 10 LGAs and 10 communities within each LGA in Bauchi and all 23 LGAs in Sokoto.

Participant identification and enrollment

The Student Support Packages (SSP) -NEI program used a survey to identify beneficiaries. A survey was carried out to map out the local governments and communities that were identified as backwards in terms of education and as having a high concentration of OVC. As a result, 10 LGAs were identified and OVC were listed and enrolled in the program based on their geographic locations. In Sokoto State, a child status index (CSI) was used to identify program OVC participants. The CSI tool used six criteria, including food and nutrition, shelter and care, protection, health, psychosocial wellbeing, and education skills to identify children in need.

Program implementation

In Bauchi and Sokoto states, the SSP-NEI intervention involved provision of SSPs containing shoes, backpacks, notebooks, pencils and pens, and other materials to students, as well as funds to the teachers. Five main program officers were responsible for program implementation, including a Protection Officer, Procurement Officer, Community Mobilization Officer, M&E Officer, and the LGA Education Secretary. Each directorate was expected to request funds from the secretary based on its needs, and the secretary was tasked with processing and approving the release of funds. The program officers were responsible for procuring the materials and supplying the materials to SBMC members and head teachers for distribution to the children. However, the program officers used a Community Action Group (CAG) a community-based NGO to supply casual workers to support the implementation of the program in their communities. In Sokoto State subgrantees including FOMWAN and a coalition of civil society organizations were used in some LGAs to deliver the program.

Associated costs

The cost for the SSP-NEI program was ₦50 million as reported by the program officers. The program officers were not able to provide the breakdown of the cost of items; instead they gave a summary of the costs of the items as ₦5,000 to ₦10,000 per participant. The program officer interviewed in Sokoto State was not part of the program at the beginning, and therefore was not able to break down the costs associated with the program. However, he estimated an average cost per child of ₦12,000.

M&E of the program

In Bauchi, the NEI-OVC program officers and grantees monitored the program through supervisory visits on a monthly basis. In Sokoto, Sokoto State OVC activities and non-formal learning center monitoring tool was used to monitor and supervise the program. Monitoring was done through quarterly supervisory visits. Observations from the visits were then reported to the technical working group (TWG) for further action.

The NEI-OVC programs in Sokoto and Bauchi states have not been formally evaluated by the state. However, based on monitoring indicators (student attendance and participation rates in school), the program increased attendance by 95% and reached approximately 5,000 participants in Bauchi State. In Sokoto State, the program reached a total of 7,297 participants.

Constraints to program effectiveness

A constraint to the program identified in Sokoto State was the lack of a smooth working relationship between the grantees and the government, mostly because the grantees were under NEI control. Lack of data and information sharing were also reported in both Bauchi and Sokoto. Stock-out of support materials was also reported.

Almajiri Integrated Model Schools (AIMS)

Target and objectives of the program

The target of the AIMS program was the Almajiri—itinerant school pupils, both boys and girls. The AIMS program was borne out of the desire to make universal basic education (UBE) inclusive of this important segment of the society. The objective of the program was to mainstream about 20% of the total Almajiri population into the UBE program by 2015 in the short term, and to mainstream all Almajiri into the UBE program by 2020 in the long term.

Participant identification and enrollment

Eligibility for enrolment and identification of participants was based on the recommendation of village heads or the community or on the discretion of the program officers. Model school locations were chosen for political reasons, with schools located per senatorial zone.

Implementation of the program

There are various categories of Qur'anic schools depending on the part of the country in which the Qur'anic school is located, including Makarantun Allo, Tsangaya or Sangaya, Tahfeez primary schools, and Islamiyya general and Islamiyya primary schools. It was based on these categories that UBEC developed its three models for effective integration of basic education into Qur'anic schools, as described below.

UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 1 School

The Model 1 required identifying existing Qur'anic schools in a locality first. If the malam expressed interest or agreed to participate in the program, the needs of the

school were assessed, and the government provided appropriate assistance and subsequently included aspects of basic education in the Qur'anic school. Typical government assistance included building classrooms, hostels, teachers' houses, toilets, and laboratories or providing building materials, beds, and beddings. The program was implemented by SUBEB, which was also responsible for posting and paying the teachers that taught basic education. The malam continued to retain control of the school; the school adopted the appropriate basic curricula to teach students.

UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 2 School

The Model 2, a model Qur'anic primary school, was also called the Almajiri Boarding School. In this model, a new school was established with the distinct philosophy and objective of imparting basic education simultaneously with Islamic education.

UBEC Almajiri Integrated Model 3 School

The Model 3 aimed to improve the quality of education and develop the capacity of the Islamiyya schools in Nigeria. The intervention included supply of instructional materials, training of teachers, posting of qualified teaching staff to teach basic core subjects, and provision of grant money based on proposals submitted by malams. The plan was to enable the Islamiyya to become a complete primary school in time. Further, the school remained under the control of the malam; SUBEB and SAME/NFE monitored and supervised the school to ensure compliance with educational standards.

Associated costs of the program

Information on total program cost and estimated cost per head of running the school was not available. However, the total budget provided by the Sokoto State government was ₦50,000,000 every year; no clear information on costs in Bauchi was available.

Monitoring & impact of the program

The program was monitored through supervisory visits that were mostly unscheduled or based on need. In addition, the program focal person (program coordinator) also used a mobile phone as a supervisory tool. No data of impact evaluation were available. However, a report made to the Qur'anic School Integration Committee (QSIC) showed a total enrollment of about 1,196,939 students in 2009, and 1,194 students in the boarding schools.

Constraints to effectiveness of the program

Key constraints to effectiveness of the program that were highlighted in interviews included the lack of a vehicle for regular monitoring visits and lack of adequate qualified teachers in the rural areas. Sociocultural barriers included a continuing lack of acceptance in the rural areas and lack of permission for women to attend the schools.

Discussion and conclusions

Substantial investments have been made and multiple strategies, policy formulations, and program cycles have been implemented in Nigeria to improve access to education for girls and marginalized members of the society, though there is limited evidence to ascertain the impact these interventions have had on their target groups. We can only hypothesize based on available evidence from countries similar to Nigeria that the interventions currently being implemented in Bauchi and Sokoto state have the potential to improve enrollment, retention, and participation in school of girls and the marginalized. Evidence exists in countries similar to Nigeria on the effectiveness of girls' education scholarships, conditional cash transfers, student support packages, and integration of the marginalized programs.

Girls' education scholarships, for example, were shown to be an effective strategy with demonstrated positive impact on all education outcomes for girls. This finding comes from countries with issues similar to those faced by Nigeria. However, recommendations from the reviewed literature suggest that girls' scholarship programs are best used in conjunction with careful selection criteria. Otherwise, girls from disadvantaged families may not be selected. This suggestion is of particular interest in Nigeria, because only a few of the interventions being implemented in Bauchi and Sokoto consistently used established criteria in selection of participants. The evidence on providing infrastructural support such as building classrooms or boarding houses, implementing feeding programs, and providing student support packages suggests that these are solid access to education strategies that positively impact both girls' enrollment and participation of marginalized groups. The AIMS, the IQE, and the student support packages programs being implemented in Bauchi and Sokoto states should therefore achieve their desired outcomes.

Challenges and Recommendations

A challenge faced in this assignment was the lack of adequate state-level data on the programs in both Bauchi and Sokoto. Several efforts were made to access the required data from implementing partners and other sources, but data were either non-existing or not accurate. Lack of monitoring data and impact assessment of the interventions made it very difficult to objectively ascertain the effectiveness and impact of the programs. The interventions were designed to improve access to education; however, there were hardly any data collected on school attendance to track progress or lack thereof. The interventions analyzed can be considered for scaling up but considering the challenges mentioned, M&E should be strengthened, a monitoring unit should be set up, and impact evaluation should be made an integral part of the programs. The evaluations should be designed to accurately measure the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the programs. Data sharing between implementing partners should be encouraged.

Key stakeholders interviewed suggest that to move forward the following steps should be taken:

- State governments should support a baseline data survey to ascertain the number of children not in school and the number of Qur'anic schools in the state.
- Communities should be galvanized to elicit their active participation in support of both formal education and IQE programs.
- State & Federal governments should increase its budgetary allocation to programs that facilitate access to education.
- More resources should be committed for monitoring to ensure quality.
- Government should recruit and deploy adequate qualified facilitators to IQE centers.
- Local government councils should give equal priority to the provision of basic education in Qur'anic schools.
- State government should provide adequate formal school facilities in all rural areas of the state to create more access to basic education and to facilitate mainstreaming of IQE learners.

Table 1. Summary of findings from referenced articles

Study	Country	Intervention	Study subjects	Outcomes/Findings
Avolio-Toly, (2010)	Guinea	Strengthen the local civil society's ability to provide literacy program (World Education)	Underprivileged children	Not evaluated
	Mali	Separate classes for females (girls/women) & males	Girls and women and parents who do not want to attend school with males (cultural barriers)	Female-only classes led to better women participation
Akyeampong, (2007)	Ghana	School feeding program	Primary & junior high school age girls	No statistical difference in enrollment of girls before and after food aid
Baird et al, (2011)	Malawi	Conditional cash transfer & unconditional cash transfer	Primary & secondary school age children	Girls' school enrollment improved in both groups, but higher in conditional cash transfer arm
Bategeke et al, (2005)	Uganda	Scholarships/reduction/abolition of school fees	Primary & secondary school age children	Increase in girls' enrollment in school was observed
Borkum, (2009)	South Africa	Reduction/abolition of school fees	Primary & secondary school age children	Secondary enrollment for girls increased only in the poorest households & not at all in better-off homes
Chapman et al, (2008)	Djibouti & Sierra Leone	Girls' merit scholarships	Secondary school age children	Continued attendance reported
Chapman et al, (2003)	Ghana	Scholarship programs	Primary & secondary school age children	Overall increase in girls' primary enrollment in program areas was observed; difference in enrollment rates of boys to girls in program primary schools was narrowed; retention among boys and girls declined; transition declined
Duflo, (2007)	Kenya	Incentive to teachers to improve quality of teaching instruction	Primary & secondary school age children	Girls' absenteeism from school dropped 11%

Study	Country	Intervention	Study subjects	Outcomes/Findings
Fiszbein, (2009)	Mozambique	Scholarships /reduction/abolition of school fees	Grade 1–5, extended to Grade 6–7	Increase in girls' enrollment in school was observed
Friedman et al, (2001)	Kenya (western Kenya)	Girls' merit scholarships	Secondary school age children	Improved test scores and secondary enrollment, fewer arranged marriages
Grogan, (2009)	Uganda	Scholarships/reduction/abolition of school fees	Primary & secondary school age children	Reduction on likelihood of late enrolment reported
Glewwe et al, (2004)	Kenya	Material support	Primary & secondary school age children	No effect on school enrollment, attendance and progression observed; positive effect on test scores reported
Joseph et al, (2012)	Ghana	Provision of text books	Junior high school & primary school age girls	At primary school, availability of extra math text books marginally increase first grade enrollment of girls, and reduce drop out; at junior high school; availability of English text books showed a negative correlation with changes in enrollment of girls
Kremer et al, (2002)	Kenya	Provision of free uniforms, text books in tandem with class room construction	Primary & secondary school age children	15% increase in girls schooling
Lehman, (2003)	Chad	Reducing distance to school (transportation and boarding)	Primary & secondary school age children	Drop-off in enrollment was more distance sensitive for girls than boys
Petrosino et al, (2012)	Malawi	Scholarships/reduction/abolition of school fees	Primary & secondary school age children	Girls' enrollment doubled
Whaley et al, (2007)	Kenya	School feeding program	Primary & secondary school age children	School feeding program increased girls' enrollment in school
World Bank, (2011)	Nigeria (Kano State)	Conditional cash transfer	Primary & secondary school age children (girls)	Participation of girls in school was boosted by 10%

References

1. United Nations (UN). (2008). The Millennium Goals Report. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. At: www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2008highlevel/pdf/newsroom/mdg%20reports/MDG
2. Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI). (2012). DFID's education programmes in Nigeria. Report 16. Prepared by ICAI with the assistance of KPMG LLP, Agulhas Applied Knowledge, Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) and the Swedish Institute for Public Administration (SIPU International). At: <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/ICAI-Nigeria-Education-report.pdf>
3. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2009). Overcoming inequality: Why governance matters. Education for All Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO. At: unesdoc.org/images/0017/001776/177609e.pdf
4. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlatf, J., and Altman, D.C. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *British Medical Journal*, 339, p. b2535.
5. Joseph, G., and Wodon, Q. (2012). Test scores in Ghana's primary schools: Measuring the impact of school inputs and socio-economic factors. World Bank paper for the Girls' Education Unit at the Ministry of Education of Ghana, Camfed Ghana, and the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom. Washington, DC: World Bank.
6. Kremer, M., Moulin, S., and Namunyu, R. (2002). Unbalanced decentralization: Results of a randomized school supplies provision program in Kenya. Cambridge: Harvard University.
7. Glewwe, P. and Olinto, P. (2004). Evaluating the impact of conditional cash transfers on schooling: An experimental analysis of Honduras' PRAF Program. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
8. Petrosino, A., Morgan, C., Fronius, T., Tanner-Smith, E., Boruch, R. (2012). Interventions in developing nations for improving primary and secondary school enrollment of children: A systematic review. Campbell Collaboration. DOI: 10.4073/csr.2012.19
9. Fiszbein, A., Schady, N., and Ferreira, F. (2009). Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty. Washington, DC: World Bank.
10. Grogan, L. (2009). Universal primary education and school entry in Uganda. *Journal of African Economies*. 18(2), p. 183-211.

11. Borkum, E. (2009). Can eliminating school fees in poor districts boost enrollment? Evidence from South Africa. New York: Columbia University, Department of Economics; Discussion Paper Series; 0910 (06).
12. Bategeka, L., and Okurut, N. (2005). Universal primary education: Uganda. Policy brief 10. London: Overseas Development Institute.
13. Baird, S., McIntosh, C., and Özler, B. (2011). Cash or condition? Evidence from a cash transfer experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 126 (4): p. 1709-1753. Doi: 10.1093/qje/qjr032
14. World Bank. (2011). Kano Conditional Cash Transfer Program for Girls' Education baseline report. Washington, DC. In: World Bank (2008). Nigeria: A review of the costs and financing of public education. Volume II: Main Report. Report 42418-NG.AFTH3, Human Development Unit, Africa Region.
15. Avolio-Toly, R. (2010). Successful models of non-governmental organizations in consultative status: Best practices in education. Los Angeles: Occidental College Los Angeles.
16. Lehman, D. (2003). Bringing the school to the children: Shortening the path to EFA. Washington, DC : World Bank.
17. Duflo, E., Hanna, R., and Ryan, S. (2007). Monitoring works: Getting teachers to come to school. *The American Economic Review*. 102(4), p. 1241–1278.
18. Whaley, S.E., Sigmund, M., Neuman, C., Bwibo, N., Guthrie, D., Weiss, R.E., Alber, S., and Murphy, S.P. (2003). The impact of dietary intervention on the cognitive development of Kenyan school children. *Journal of Nutrition*. 133(11), p. 3965S–71S.
19. Akyeampong, K., Djangmah, J., Oduro, A., Siedu, A., and Hunt, F. (2007). Access to basic education in Ghana: The evidence and the issues. Country Analytic Report. United Kingdom: Centre for International Education, Sussex School of Education, University of Sussex.
20. Chapman, D., Emert, H., and Osei, J. (2003). Evaluation of the African Girls' Education Initiative. Country Case Study: Ghana. UNICEF. At: www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/Ghana_Case_Study.pdf
21. Chapman, D.W., and Mushlin, S. (2008). Do girls' scholarship programs work: Evidence from two countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 28(4), p. 460-472.
22. Friedman, W., Kremer, E., Thornton, R. (2011). Education as Liberation? National Bureau of Economic Research No. 16939. 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge.

References (CORRECTED & ALPHABETICALLY ARRANGED)

1. Avolio-Toly, R. (2010). Successful models of non-governmental organizations in consultative status: Best practices in education. Los Angeles: Occidental College Los Angeles.
2. Akyeampong, K., Djangmah, J., Oduro, A., Siedu, A., and Hunt, F. (2007). Access to basic education in Ghana: The evidence and the issues. Country Analytic Report. United Kingdom: Centre for International Education, Sussex School of Education, University of Sussex.
3. Baird, S., McIntosh, C., and Özler, B. (2011). Cash or condition? Evidence from a cash transfer experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 126 (4): p. 1709-1753. Doi: 10.1093/qje/qjr032
4. Bategeka, L., and Okurut, N. (2005). Universal primary education: Uganda. Policy brief 10. London: Overseas Development Institute.
5. Borkum, E. (2009). Can eliminating school fees in poor districts boost enrollment? Evidence from South Africa. New York: Columbia University, Department of Economics; Discussion Paper Series; 0910 (06).
6. Chapman, D.W., and Mushlin, S. (2008). Do girls' scholarship programs work: Evidence from two countries. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 28(4), p. 460-472.
7. Chapman, D., Emert, H., and Osei, J. (2003). Evaluation of the African Girls' Education Initiative. Country Case Study: Ghana. UNICEF. At: www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/Ghana_Case_Study.pdf
8. Duflo, E., Hanna, R., and Ryan, S. (2007). Monitoring works: Getting teachers to come to school. *The American Economic Review*. 102(4), p. 1241-1278.
9. Fiszbein, A., Schady, N., and Ferreira, F. (2009). Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty. Washington, DC: World Bank.
10. Friedman, W., Kremer, E., Thornton, R. (2011). Education as Liberation? National Bureau of Economic Research No. 16939. 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge.
11. Grogan, L. (2009). Universal primary education and school entry in Uganda. *Journal of African Economies*. 18(2), p. 183-211.
12. Glewwe, P. and Olinto, P. (2004). Evaluating the impact of conditional cash transfers on schooling: An experimental analysis of Honduras' PRAF Program. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota.
13. Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI). (2012). DFID's education programmes in Nigeria. Report 16. Prepared by ICAI with the assistance of KPMG LLP, Agulhas Applied Knowledge, Center for Effective Global Action (CEGA) and the Swedish Institute for Public Administration (SIPU International). At: <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp->

14. Joseph, G., and Wodon, Q. (2012). Test scores in Ghana's primary schools: Measuring the impact of school inputs and socio-economic factors. World Bank paper for the Girls' Education Unit at the Ministry of Education of Ghana, Camfed Ghana, and the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom. Washington, DC: World Bank.
15. Kremer, M., Moulin, S., and Namunyu, R. (2002). Unbalanced decentralization: Results of a randomized school supplies provision program in Kenya. Cambridge: Harvard University.
16. Lehman, D. (2003). Bringing the school to the children: Shortening the path to EFA. Washington, DC : World Bank.
17. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlatf, J., and Altman, D.C. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. British Medical Journal, 339, p. b2535.
18. Petrosino, A., Morgan, C., Fronius, T., Tanner-Smith, E., Boruch, R. (2012). Interventions in developing nations for improving primary and secondary school enrollment of children: A systematic review. Campbell Collaboration. DOI: 10.4073/csr.2012.19
19. United Nations (UN). (2008). The Millennium Goals Report. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. At: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2008highlevel/pdf/newsroom/mdg%20reports/MDG_Report_2008_ENGLISH.pdf
20. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2009). Overcoming inequality: Why governance matters. Education for All Monitoring Report. Paris: UNESCO. At: unesdoc.org/images/0017/001776/177609e.pdf
21. Whaley, S.E., Sigmund, M., Neuman, C., Bwibo, N., Guthrie, D., Weiss, R.E., Alber, S., and Murphy, S.P. (2003). The impact of dietary intervention on the cognitive development of Kenyan school children. Journal of Nutrition. 133(11), p. 3965S–71S.
22. World Bank. (2011). Kano Conditional Cash Transfer Program for Girls' Education baseline report. Washington, DC. In: World Bank (2008). Nigeria: A review of the costs and financing of public education. Volume II: Main Report. Report 42418-NG.AFTH3, Human Development Unit, Africa Region.

Annex 1. Questionnaires

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BENEFICIARIES

Hello, my name is _____ and we are conducting a research study to examine the impact of various programs in Nigeria designed to improve access and participation in schooling. As you are either a direct or indirect beneficiary of the program, we would like to interview you in order to help us understand how best to sustain such programs over time. It is important that you answer all questions truthfully and as accurately as possible.

The information you provide will be incorporated into a report prepared for the Ministry of Education and international donors and implementing partners. Personally- identifiable information such as your name will not be included.

Do you have any questions? May I proceed?

- If “YES”, proceed with the interview.
- If “NO”, thank the person and ask if there is another person they would recommend sitting for the interview (do not insist or pressure them to sit for the interview).

Gender:

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

State, Local government & Community: _____

Position/title: _____

Name of school: _____

Age: _____

Semi structured interview with direct & indirect beneficiaries

1. How do you think the program is doing/ has done and why? _____

2. How is the program helping your community/schooling? _____

-
-
3. Did you ever receive direct support from this program? ☐ YES ☐ NO
- a. If so, what kind of support did you receive? _____

- b. How frequently or often did you receive this support? _____

- c. When was the last time you received support? _____

- d. Do you expect to receive future support? _____

- e. If so, when? _____

4. Before receiving support, how often did you miss school and what were the reasons? _____

5. While you were receiving support, how often did you miss school and what were the reasons? _____

6. What in your opinion will happen to you if the program ends? Will you continue to go to school? _____

7. What in your view would you like this program to do to improve access to education for other girls or disadvantaged children? _____

8. What in your opinion are the major reasons why some people don't enrol their children, particularly girls in school? _____

9. Can you specifically tell us the cultural norms and attitudes affecting girls' ability to enrol, attend or complete their schooling in your community?_____
- _____
- _____
10. How can it be addressed?_____
- _____
- _____
11. In your opinion, what would the program do/add/improve to create more impact?_____
- _____
- _____
12. How can this program or any other education program be sustained in your community?_____
- _____
- _____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROGRAM OFFICERS/FOCAL PERSONS

Introduction:

Hello, my name is _____ and we are conducting a research study to examine the impact of various programs in Nigeria designed to improve access and participation in schooling. You have been identified as an officer of such a program. I would like to interview you in order to help us understand how best to sustain such programs over time. It is important that you answer all questions truthfully and as accurately as possible.

The information you provide will be incorporated into a report prepared for the Ministry of Education and international donors and implementing partners. Personally-identifiable information such as your name will not be included.

Do you have any questions? May I proceed?

- If “YES”, proceed with the interview.
- If “NO”, thank the person and ask if there is another person they would recommend sitting for the interview (do not insist or pressure them to sit for the interview).

Program Information

State: _____

Name of Program: _____

Objective: _____

Project partners: _____

Funding source (s): _____

Duration of the program: _____

Current program year: _____

Target group: _____

Name /ID Gender of interviewee: _____

-
- ☐ Male
☐ Female

Program Design

1. Who designed the program and what are the main factors considered in designing the program? _____

2. Before the program designed, was a baseline study or need assessment carried out? ____

 - a. If yes, ask for a copy _____
 - b. If not, why not? _____
3. How many local governments & communities are selected? _____

4. What are the criteria for the selection? _____

5. What instrument was used for the selection? _____

6. What is the number of target beneficiaries? _____

7. How were the beneficiaries selected? _____

8. What are the criteria for selection and what instrument was used? _____

- _____
- _____
9. What is the total budget of the program? _____
- _____
10. What is the direct cost of the program? _____
- _____
11. Who is funding the program? _____
- _____
12. Have you revived funding for the program? If yes, for how long? _____
- _____
13. Are you still receiving funding? ☐ YES ☐ NO
13. If yes, when will the funding end? _____
- _____
14. If not, when did the funding stopped? _____
- _____
15. What is the cost on expenditure per beneficiary (direct unit costs of the inputs only):
- a. per month _____
- b. per year _____
16. Can you break down the costs by inputs (for example, if a package is provided, please detail the items and their costs)? _____
- _____
17. Is the Government replicating this program in other school-communities?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
18. If yes, which MDA is implementing this program? _____
- _____

Note: Collect all documents/instruments on program design from the officer

Program Implementation

1. Describe the process of the program implementation? _____

2. Prompt quest: How intervention/provisions are delivered to the target beneficiaries?____

3. How many officers are responsible for the program implementation in the state? _____

4. What is the role of the main officers? _____

5. Do you have other non-program officers that are supporting you in implementing the program? _____

6. If so, who are they and what are their main tasks? _____

7. Since the implementation of the program, how would you say the program is doing/has done? _____

8. If successful, how would you define a successful program? _____

9. What are the key factors that contributed to achieving your programmatic goals? _____

10. What are the key constraints in the implementation of the program? _____

11. Can something be done to improve or combat these constrains? _____

12. Do you have strategies or system in place that will ensure program sustainability and scaling up? ☐ YES ☐ NO

a. If yes, describe _____

13. What would you say are the key factors that will constrain this program from scaling up or sustained? _____

14. At what level of government (Federal, State, Local) is there most potential to partner/coordinate for effective program implementation?

☐ Federal

☐ State

☐ Local

a. Why is that? _____

15. Which MDA have you coordinated with and at which level of government (Federal, state, local) would you say their partnership/contribution is more effective? _____

16. What are the various types of contributions/support given to this program by the government? _____

17. Which ones are the most effective? _____
Why? _____

18. Are there economic, social factors or policies that contributed in underpinning/undermining the implementation or impact of this program?

☐ YES ☐ NO

a. Explain _____

19. What are the main cultural norms and attitudes amongst government counterparts or community beneficiaries that have affected the success or failure of this program? _____

20. What are the informal/formal barriers to education programs in general? _____

21. How did this program overcome all the above obstacles and barriers? And what are the main lessons learnt implementing this program? _____

22. Do you know of positive education innovations internationally or in other States in Nigeria that have led to increased access in education? _____

23. At what level of government (Federal, State, Local) do you think is the most potential for you to influence change? _____

Note: Collect all documents/instruments on program implementation

Program beneficiaries

1. How many beneficiaries have you enrolled in the program ? i.e total number of beneficiaries reached by the program _____

2. What is the proportion of boys and girls in the program? _____

3. What was the school attendance rate before the program? _____
 Where did you get the data? _____

4. What is the current attendance rate? _____
 And how did you arrive at the rate? _____

5. What is your current drop out rate? _____
 And how did you arrive at the rate? _____

6. How many of the beneficiaries dropped out of the program after:

1st year: _____

2nd year: _____

3rd year: _____

4th year: _____

5th year: _____

7. If the rate is higher at a particular year of the program ☐ YES ☐ NO

a. why is that? _____

8. What are the main reasons for dropping out? _____

9. Did any of the beneficiaries drop out of school after the funding stopped?

☐ Yes

☐ No

10. If yes, how many in total dropped out after the funding has stopped? _____

11. If after the funding has stopped beneficiaries continue to participate in the program, mention the main reasons why? _____

12. How many beneficiaries completed their education? _____

Note: Collect all documents/instruments on program beneficiaries

Program Monitoring & Evaluation

1. Describe the process of monitoring & evaluation of this program? _____

2. What monitoring and evaluation strategies/instrument do you use for capturing data? _____

-
3. What are the program indicators (input, output & outcomes) of monitoring this program? _____
- _____
4. Do you have documentation/evidence that supports the attendance / participation rates? _____
- _____
5. What are the figures for the following?
- a. The school enrolment rate before the program _____
- _____
- b. The enrolment & attendance rate during the program _____
- _____
- c. The enrolment & attendance rate after the program _____
- _____
6. What are your data sources? _____
- _____
7. What are the main lessons learnt during monitoring & evaluation of this program? _____
- _____

Program Impact

1. Is the impact of this program formally assessed? _____
- _____
2. What are the examples of the impacts that have been assessed? _____
- _____
3. Provide examples/evidence of these changes & impacts? _____
- _____
4. Are these impacts positive or negative? Elaborate. _____

Any remark, addition?

Annex 2. Field Work: People Interviewed

Organization & position of people met	Description of Activity	Names
Bauchi State		
Interview with CCT (World bank & UNICEF) Desk Officer Bauchi State.	Met with Korijo Abubakar, the officer in charge of CCT program in Bauchi State. The process of CCT started in 2010 with a great deal of planning and capacity building of officers. The actual project implementation started and ended in 2011 with only one time cash transfer to beneficiaries. The project demise was due to disagreement between SUBEB and MDGs Office on CCT objectives and funding in the state.	Korijo Abubakar , Sadiq Illelah & Aisha Garba – Consultant.
Meeting with SUBEB Director Planning, Research & Statistics / Coordinator Director of Donor projects	Met with SUBEB Director of donor programs on education. Discussed existing education programs in Bauchi State (CCT, FTTS, GEP & NEI). The Director highlighted some of the major constrains & achievements of education programs in the state.	Shehu Iliyasu, Sadiq Illelah & Aisha Garba – Consultant.
Meeting with Director Child Development and NEI-OVC support officer –Bauchi State.	Met with Director Child Development and OVC assistant support officer at MOWA. Discussed implementation of NEI-OVC by MOWA in detailed however, they could not provide evidence, documentation to back the information up and the desk officer was out of town.	Aisha Garba & Larai Hammadu.
Meeting with MDGs Special assistant to the governor and the technical officer	Discussed MDGS-CCT program for poverty alleviation in Bauchi state with SSA and their technical officer. The program (CCT-MDGs) is on yearly rolling basis; Funds are given to beneficiaries for a year after which they will exit/graduate from the program and new people will be enrolled. There is no tools or monitoring of compliance.	Maryam Mohd, Jibril M Yusuf, Sadiq Illelah & Aisha Garba.
Meeting with OVC-BASOVCA.	Met with BASOVCA support officer and discussed OVC.	Hussein Libidi & Aisha Garba
Meeting with GEP desk officer SUBEB- Bauchi State.	Met with the newly appointed GEP desk officer at SUBEB. He was not able to give all the necessary information and data however, he directed us to other officers for more information.	Ismaila H Umar.
Meeting with desk officer NEI- USAID programs	Met with NEI officer at SUBEB discussed and collected relevant information about the program.	Garba Audi Bauchi.
Meeting with FTTSS officer- SUBEB Bauchi State.	Met with the FTTSS desk officer, it was clear FTTSS is the main support for girls' education under the GEP, however, there is no M & E component in the program nor is impact assessment ever conducted since the program commenced in 2008.	Suleiman Mohammed & Aisha Garba
Meeting with officer in charge Special needs education- SUBEB Bauchi State.	Discussed special needs education and areas in need of additional support	Larai Bishams & Aisha Garba.
Meeting with MOE Program support.	Met with UNICEF focal person & HIV/AIDS desk officer at Ministry of Education.	Umar Sani, Asabe Yahaya & Aisha Garba.

Organization & position of people met	Description of Activity	Names
Interview with NEI beneficiaries (Adolescent training center)	Interviewed program beneficiaries at Doya Women center.	Aisha Garba.
Interview with NEI trainers/head teachers.	Interviewed trainers and officers in charge of Doya women center.	Aisha Garba.
Meeting with officer Gender programs SUBEB.	Met with Gender officer at SUBEB and discussed gender programs particularly on education and skills acquisition.	Maimuna Amin & Aisha Garba.
Sokoto State		
Meeting with the Student Support Packages focal persons.	Shuaibu Mohammad Lawal (Deputy director child) and Safina (desk officer) were interviewed on student support packages. In addition to the questionnaire administered, the deputy director child provided a comprehensive background on enrolment and agencies implementing the student support packages program.	Shuaibu Mohammad Lawal (Deputy director child MOWA) and Safina (desk officer) & Nasir Umar (consultant).
Meeting with Malam Umar Boyi – AIMS SUBEB	Met with the coordinator Almajiri Integrated Model Schools (AIMS) from Ministry of Religious Affairs Malam Umar Boyi. Malam Umar explained the different models operating under the Almajiri integrated program, funding and funding sources. Further, Malam Umar described the formal and non-formal way he monitors and supervised the program.	Malam Umar Boyi (AIMS SUBEB State Coordinator) & Nasir Umar (consultant).
Meeting with the Director Planning, Research & Statistics Ministry of Education.	Interviewed the Director Planning, Research & Statistics Ministry of Education on Conditional Cash Transfer and Girl Education scholarship. According to the DPRS MOE, the CCT in Sokoto State is still at the planning stages – technical working group established.	Mohammad Attahiru Ahmad (DPRS MOE) & Nasir Umar (consultant).
Meeting with the IQE integration program officer.	Interviewed Abubakar Mohammad Alkammu on IQE integration program. Mr Alkammu explained the strategies used in support of IQE, enrolment, funding and funding sources.	Abubakar Mohammad Alkammu (SAME IQE) & Nasir Umar (consultant)
Meeting with Mahmud Galadima, special needs officer Sokoto State.	Met with the special needs officer Mahmud Galadima Sokoto State. Malam Galadima described the Sokoto State pilot program on inclusive education, highlighting the successes and constraints of the program.	Mahmud Galadima (Pecial needs officer) and Nasir Umar (consultant).
Meeting with the Director resource centre.	Interviewed the Director resource centre on women centre for continue education. The director answered question relating to the program implementation, funding, funding sources, target beneficiaries and enrolment figures.	Director resource centre and Nasir Umar (consultant).
Interviews with beneficiaries of Almajiri Integrated Model Schools.	Visited one of the Almajiri Integrated model schools and interviewed beneficiaries on program performance, benefit packages and acceptance of the program.	Beneficiaries & Nasir Umar (consultant).
Visit to women centre for continue education.	The consultant went to the women centre for continue education with the intention of interviewing the program beneficiaries, unfortunately the school closed for mid-term break earlier that very day, the principal was also away.	Aliyu Abdullahi Isa & Nasir Umar

Organization & position of people met	Description of Activity	Names
Debriefing with Sokoto State research coordinator.	The consultant met with the Sokoto State research coordinator and discussed the tasks completed and outstanding issues – some focal persons promised to pass on other additional documents to the consultant via the research coordinator.	[Aliyu Abdullahi & Nasir Umar]

ACCESS ANALYSIS TABLES

Table 2. Access analysis frame Bauchi state

Activity and period of performance (in years)	State and number of LGAs	Target Beneficiary(ies)	No. Of target beneficiaries	How was beneficiary identified (characteristics/ criteria)? If survey instrument is used, get copy.	Intervention description (describe who procures, how the provisions are delivered and who receives them)	Describe the process and indicators (input, output and outcome indicators) for monitoring and evaluating the program	Total Beneficiary reached	Program Cost (direct costs of the program only) Obtain budget of direct cost line items of the program if possible	Cost per beneficiary	Evidence of sustained participation of beneficiaries in the formal or non-formal schooling system? Obtain most recent M&E documentation
Student-support packages (NEI)	Bauchi (10 LGAs)	Orphans and vulnerable children	target number not clear	OVC survey	Provision of student support packages containing shoes, backpack, notebook, pencils and pens and other materials Provided to SMC members and head teachers to distribute to children Implemented and procured directly by the project, which distributed the materials to schools.	NEI program officers and grants collect information on recipients on a monthly basis. Indicators include attendance and participation rate in school.	5,000 children reached	The total cost was NGN 50 million	NGN 10,000 per beneficiary	Participation rate of beneficiaries was 95% attendance during life of NEI.
Conditional Cash Transfer (World Bank)	Bauchi (6 LGAs) Sokoto	7-15 year old girls	10,000 beneficiaries from 7,800 households	Eligibility criteria was used to select Households of the beneficiaries. a. Household lacking in appropriate dwelling place b. HH lacking in regular means of income c. HH headed by disadvantaged females d. HH with OVC children e. HH that is not receiving benefit from other programs. F. HH must have girls in upper level primary who are enrolled or dropped out of school	1. The sum of NGN5,000 to be paid to each beneficiary girl-child 4 times a year. 2. The money shall be paid to the mother or the caregiver of the beneficiary child through the SBMC of the school at which the child is enrolled. 3. The transfer shall be disbursed at the last week to the commencement of the school term to enable preparation for the school. 4. A separate CCT account shall be opened with a Micro Finance Bank closest to the community.	Monitoring the beneficiaries for compliance on monthly basis by M & E officers and field supervisors. Indicators include enrolment, attendance, completion and transition rate in schools	9,874 girls received first transfer	N600,000.000.00 (3 year program)	NGN5,000 Per beneficiary Four payments in a year =NGN20,000 per beneficiary per year	Expected outcome: a. 25 percent increase in the present number of girl children in basic education schools b. 25 percent increase in transition rates of girl children from lower level of primary to higher level and junior secondary schools c. School attendance for girl children in basic education school to increase generally by 25 percent d. Household expenditures on education of girl children to increase by 100 percent.
Girls Education Scholarship Programs (GEP)	Bauchi (20 LGAs)	3-18 year olds	1 million girls	Selection criteria: A. Rural girls that graduated from high school B. Exam results, minimum of 5 pass credits C. Must be Indigene of Bauchi state D. Must agree to sign a bond that after graduating, they will go back to their communities to teach	A. Schools fees, feeding and accommodation fees paid directly to the colleges of the beneficiaries for the duration of their study/training as teachers B. Beneficiaries to be trained as teachers and return to their communities to teach after graduation	Field supervision by officers to schools to check the well being of the beneficiaries (No tool used)	over 1,000 girls trained as teachers (no exact number)		NGN50,000 per girl per annum	

Table 3. Access analysis frame Sokoto state

Activity and period of performance (in years)	State and number of LGAs	Target Beneficiary(ies)	No. Of target beneficiaries	How was beneficiary identified (characteristics/criteria)? If survey instrument is used, get copy.	Intervention description (describe who procures, how the provisions are delivered and who receives them)	Describe the process and indicators (input, output and outcome indicators) for monitoring and evaluating the program	Total Beneficiary reached	Program Cost (direct costs of the program only) Obtain budget or direct cost line items of the program if possible	Cost per beneficiary	Evidence of sustained participation of beneficiaries in the formal or non-formal schooling system? Obtain most recent M&E documentation
Student-support packages (NEI)	Sokoto state (23 LGAs)	Orphans and vulnerable children (0-17 years)	Target number not clear	Child status index (CSI) was used to identify program beneficiaries – orphans and vulnerable children. The CSI tool has six dimension including food and nutrition, shelter and care, protection, health, psychosocial and education skills used to identify children in need.	Provision of student support packages containing shoes, backpack, notebook, pencils and pens and other materials Provided to SMC members and head teachers to distribute to children Implemented and procured directly by the project, which distributed the materials to schools.	NEI program officers and grants collect information on recipients on a monthly basis. Indicators include attendance and participation rate in school.	A total of 7297	Data not available	NGN 12,000 per beneficiary	A total of 7297
Conditional Cash Transfer (World Bank)	Sokoto state	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented	Yet to be implemented
Girls Education Scholarship Programs (GEP)	Sokoto state (started with all the LGAs, now only in & LGAs)	3-18 year olds	Target number not clear	Selection criteria: A. Rural girls that graduated from high school B. Exam results, minimum of 2 credit 2 passes C. Must be indigene of Sokoto state. D. Must agree to sign a bond that after graduating, they will go back to their communities to teach. E. Family status	A. Schools fees, feeding and accommodation fees paid directly to the colleges of the beneficiaries for the duration of their study/training as teachers B. Beneficiaries to be trained as teachers and return to their communities to teach after graduation. C. Beneficiaries are given N5000 monthly allowance	Field supervision by program officers to check the well being of the beneficiaries (No tool used)	About 900 girls trained as teachers (no exact number)	Data not available	NGN50,000 per girl per annum	
IQE	Sokoto state (23 LGAs)	Itinerants otherwise called tsangaya/almajiri	target number not clear/ data not available	No specific tool used: Selection of Qur'anic school is based on the interest of the Proprietor (malam) to participate in the IQE program. Following the acceptance of the informal Qur'anic school in the program, all the Almajiris in the school subsequently become beneficiaries.	Immediate benefit upon acceptance of the Qur'anic School in to the program includes cash grant to the proprietor, material supports to the school and students (e.g. reading and writing materials, books et cetera) and feeding of students. The school receives instructors/ facilitators that will teach or introduce formal courses in to the school. The running of the IQE program is divided between three state agencies: SAME, MORA and SUBEB.	A focal person monitored the program through routine visits to the IQE centers, and the supervisory visit does not involve the use of a formal M&E tool.	117,238 learners and mainstreaming of 25,000 IQE learners some of which are now graduates of tertiary education	Data not available	Estimate 2000 Naira/Beneficiary/Month	Data not available
AIMS	Sokoto State	Itinerants otherwise called tsangaya/almajiri	target number not clear/data not available	No formal criteria: eligibility for enrolment and identification of beneficiaries is based on recommendation of village heads, the community or discretion of the program officers.	Model 1: SUBEB is responsible for posting and paying the teachers that will teach basic education. Model 2: run by SUBEB and Agency for Mass Education. Model 3: under SUBEB control.	Field supervision by program officers to schools to check the well being of the beneficiaries (No tool used)	A total enrolment of about 1,196,939, in 2009, and 1,194 student in the boarding	Not clear, however, the total budget provided by the Sokoto state government is NGN 50,000,000 every year	Data not available	Data not available